

REMARKS

Claims 57-120 were pending and under examination. Claims 57-120 have been canceled herein without prejudice to Applicants pursuing these claims in a related application. New claims 121-239 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification and the claims as filed. In particular, support for the new claims can be found, for example, in original claims 2-17 and on page 3, lines 12-24; page 5, lines 9-14; page 6, line 25, to page 7, line 1; and page 8, lines 1-2; page 12, lines 18-19. Accordingly, these new claims do not raise an issue of new matter and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The rejection of claims 57-119 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking written description is respectfully traversed. Applicants submit, for the reasons of record, that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance for the claimed methods and that the claimed methods are fully supported by the specification as filed. Without conceding the merit of the rejection, applicants nevertheless have canceled claims 57-119. The rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims, and Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the remarks in the Office Action related to the oxygen source, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that sodium hydroxide is not an oxidizing agent. While the specification describes that peroxide is an oxygen source, the specification clearly teaches that other oxygen sources can be used (see page 12, line 18). For example, the passage on page 6, lines 20-24, of the specification referred to in the Office Action lies in the following context:

Preferably the oxygen source is a peroxide. It may be hydrogen peroxide, sodium peroxide, zinc peroxide, barium peroxide, calcium peroxide, or lithium peroxide. The oxygen source may include a hydroxide such as sodium hydroxide. The oxygen source is capable of penetrating the substrate and reacting with the metal salt to impart a stable color or other physical characteristic to the substrate.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action that the antecedent basis for “oxygen source” in the sentence describing sodium hydroxide is “peroxide.” It is respectfully submitted that this sentence is describing the oxygen source, and there is no

indication that the “oxygen source” only refers to peroxide. The indication that peroxide is a preferable oxygen source does not mean that peroxide is the only oxygen source (see page 12, lines 14-19). It is respectfully submitted that the context of the sentence indicating that the “oxygen source may include a hydroxide such as sodium hydroxide” does not have antecedent basis to “peroxide”. Furthermore, the claims as filed in the above-identified application include claims reciting that the oxidizing agent can be sodium hydroxide (see, for example, claims 9 and 10). Therefore, Applicant respectfully maintains that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance for claims reciting sodium hydroxide as an oxygen source.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claim 120 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Dombay, U.S. Patent No. 3,554,785, is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim, and it is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn. With respect to new claims 121-239, Applicant respectfully submits that this reference does not teach the claimed methods.

The rejection of claim 120 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Matsushita, Japanese patent No. JP 60-250906, is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim, and it is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn. With respect to new claims 121-239, Applicant respectfully submits that this reference does not teach the claimed methods.

The rejection of claim 120 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Bures, CS145495, is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim, and it is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn. With respect to new claims 121-239, Applicant respectfully submits that this reference does not teach the claimed methods.

In light of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if there are any questions.

Serial No.: 09/932,976

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Deborah L. Cadena

Registration No. 44,048

4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700

San Diego, CA 92122

858.535.9001 DLC:jrl

Facsimile: 858.597.1585

Date: September 2, 2004

SDO 16507-1.067234.0011